

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ichioka et al. (US 5,546,013).

Claims 2, 6-9, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichioka et al. in view of Hayashida (US 6,137,300).

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichioka et al.

Claims 11-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashida in view of Ichioka et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, 17, and 18. Accordingly, claims 1-19 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ichioka et al. (US 5,546,013), claims 2, 6-9, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichioka et al. in view of Hayashida (US 6,137,300), claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichioka et al., and claims 11-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashida in view of Ichioka et al.. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 4, 11, and 18 all recite a glass substrate having “a plurality of liquid crystal display panels.” In contrast to the claimed invention, Ichioka et al. teaches a substrate 10 having a single TFT array 12, and Hayashida teaches only a single display panel 20. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion in either of Ichioka et al. and Hayashida to include an apparatus for inspecting or a method of testing a glass substrate having a plurality of liquid crystal display panels. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that both Ichioka et al. and Hayashida fail to teach or suggest a glass substrate including “a plurality of” liquid crystal display panels, as recited by amended independent claims 1, 4, 11, and 18, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12-17, and 19.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because Ichioka et al. and Hayashida, whether taken singly or combined, neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1, 4, 11, and 18, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12-17, and 19.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments to claims 1, 10, and 21, reconsideration of the application as amended, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: December 30, 2003

CUSTOMER NO. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000